

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/577,499	04/28/2006	Bruno Bleines	B829. 312-0001	9933	
164 7590 05/23/2008 KINNEY & LANGE, P.A. THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING			EXAM	EXAMINER	
			HOLMES, MICHAEL B		
312 SOUTH THIRD STREET MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55415-1002			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2129		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/23/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/577,499 BLEINES, BRUNO Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit Michael B. Holmes 2129 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE (3) MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2006. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) 18 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 28 April 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s)

Application/Control Number: 10/577,499

Art Unit: 2129



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 - www.uspto.gov

Examiner's Detailed Office Action

This Office Action is responsive to communication, filed 04/28/2006.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. Applicant is respectfully remind of the Duty to disclose 37 C.F.R. 1.56 all pertinent information and material pertaining to the patentability of applicant's claimed invention, by continuing to submitting in a timely manner PTO-1449, Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) with the filing of applicant's of application or thereafter.

Drawings

3. The formal drawing(s) submitted have been reviewed by the Office of Initial Patent Examination (OIPE) and/or the USPTO Office of Draftperson's Patent Drawings Review.
Figure 1, needs to have all processing objects labeled i.e., in total.

Specification

 The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Appropriate correction is required. Application/Control Number: 10/577,499 Page 3

Art Unit: 2129

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

 Claims 1-17 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyazaki et al. (European Patent Application: EP 1 193 637 A1).

Regarding claim 1.

Miyazaki et al. describes a method of health monitoring implementing a medical diagnosis established by a medically-qualified person concerning a remotely-monitored patient, in particular at his home, and monitored via a communications network, characterized in that: the medically-qualified person associates medical data with health actions in a server via monitoring rules, the server programs a distant terminal, located near the patient in such a way that the distant terminal implements an automatism applying the monitoring rules to the medical data provided to the terminal by at least one sensor associated with the patient and/or by a man-machine interface of the distant terminal and/or by a man-machine interface of a networked station and/or by the network. [see FIG. 1 & page 4, line 6 - line 56 & page 9, line 56 to page 10, line 11 & page 11, line 18 - line 56]

Regarding claims 2-17.

of which, add no novelty and are rejected under the same rationale as the base claim. [see FIG. 1 & page 4, line 6 - line 56 & page 9, line 56 to page 10, line 11 & page 11, line 18 - line 56]

Application/Control Number: 10/577,499 Page 4

Art Unit: 2129

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 18 is allowed.

Claim Interpretation

- 8. The claims and only the claims form the metes and bounds of the invention. "Office personnel are to give the claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Moreover, limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d, 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541,550-551 (CCPA 1969)" (MPEP p 2100-8, c 2,145-48; p 2100-9, c 1,1 1-4).
- 9. The Examiner has full latitude to interpret each claim in the broadest reasonable sense.
 The Examiner will reference prior art using terminology familiar to one of ordinary skill in the art. Such an approach is broad in concept and can be either explicit or implicit in meaning.
- 10. Examiner's Notes are/if provided with the cited references to prior art to assist the applicant to better understand the nature of the prior art, application of such prior art and, as appropriate, to further indicate other prior art that maybe applied in other office actions. Such comments are entirely consistent with the intent and spirit of compact prosecution. However, and unless otherwise stated, the citations are self-explanatory to one skilled in the art and do not need any further explanation. Moreover, the Examiner's Notes are not prior art but a link to prior art that one of ordinary skill in the art would find inherently or obviously appropriate.
- 11. Unless otherwise annotated, as aforementioned, Examiner's statements are to be interpreted in reference to that of one of ordinary skill in the art. Statements made in

Art Unit: 2129

reference to the condition of the disclosure constitute, on the face of it, the basis and such would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, establishing thereby an inherent or obviousness prima facie case or statement(s).

Correspondence Information

12. Any inquires concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael B. Holmes, who may be reached Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. EST. or via telephone at (571) 272-3686 or facsimile transmission (571) 273-3686 or email michael.holmesb@uspto.gov.

If you need to send an Official facsimile transmission, please send it to (571) 273-8300.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful the Examiner's Supervisor, David Vincent, may be reached at (571) 272-3080.

Hand-delivered responses should be delivered to the Receptionist @ (Customer Service Window Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22313), located on the first floor of the south side of the Randolph Building.

Finally, information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Moreover, status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) toll-free @ 1-866-217-9197.

Art Unit: 2129

Michael B. Holmes
Primary Examiner
Artificial Intelligence
Art Unit 2129
United States Department of Commerce
Patent & Trademark Office

Wednesday, May 21, 2008

MBH

/Michael B. Holmes/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2129